REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 24, 2009. Claims 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 17, 19, 22, 23 and 26 to 28 are pending in the application, of which Claims 7, 12, 17, 19 and 26 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 8 , 11, 12, 17, 18, 22 and 23 were objected to for informalities. Without conceding the correctness of any objection, the objections have been attended to by amendment in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, as set out above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections.

Claims 7 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, Applicant has canceled Claim 8 as it incorporated limitations that were already inherent in Claim 7. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 7, 8, 12 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,633,400 (Sasaki) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,328,405 (Aschenbrenner). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Aschenbrenner and U.S. Patent No. 6,525,721 (Thomas). Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Aschenbrenner and U.S. Published Appln. No. 2002/0105661 (Nishida). Claims 19 and 22 to 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of "PostScript Printer Description File Format Specification" (hereafter "the PostScript specification"). Claims 20 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of the PostScript specification. Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 12 and 17

Independent Claims 7, 12 and 17 generally concern downloading resources to a device having a printing function. A resource which is downloadable to the device is determined (Claims 7 and 12) or selected (Claim 17).

Claims 7, 12 and 17 feature adding or deleting resources to be downloaded in accordance with whether or not a user designates the resources on a user interface. If the resource is a font or a form, the processing of this resource is changed over to processing for adding a font or a form which is designated by a user and is not stored in the device, and deleting a font or a form which is stored in the device and is not designated by the user; otherwise, if the resource is a color profile, the processing of this resource is changed over in the changeover step to processing for adding a color profile which is designated by the user and is not stored in the device without deleting a color profile which is stored in the device and is not designated by the user.

In a system in accordance with Claim 7, 12, or 17, only the user designates the resources to be downloaded on the user interface. Therefore, it is possible to delete the resources which are stored in the device and are not designated as well as the addition of the resources which are designated and are not stored in the device.

Referring specifically to claim language, independent Claim 7 is directed to a resource processing method for downloading resources to a device having a printing function. The method includes a decision step of determining processing of a resource, which is downloadable to the device, in dependence upon the resource to be downloaded to the device. The method also includes a changeover step of changing over to processing of the resource based upon a result of a decision made in said decision step. If the resource is a font or a form, the processing of this resource is changed over in the changeover step to processing for adding a font or a form which is designated by a user and is not stored in the device and deleting a font or a form which is stored in the device and is not designated by the user; otherwise, if the resource is a color profile, the processing of this resource is changed over in the changeover step to processing for adding a color profile which is designated by the user and is not stored in the device without deleting a color profile which is stored in the device and is not designated by the user, and wherein the designation by the user is performed on a user interface.

Independent Claim 12 is directed to an apparatus substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 7.

Independent Claim 17 is directed to a resource processing method for downloading resources to a device having a printing function. The method includes a reception step of making a resource selection of a font, a form or a color profile as a type of resource, which is downloadable to the device. The method also includes a process step of performing processing for adding a font or a form which is designated by a user and not stored in the device and deleting a font or a form which is stored in the device and is not designated by the user for the device in accordance with a user instruction; otherwise, if the selected resource is the font or the form, or performing processing for adding a color profile which is designated by the user and is not stored in the device without deleting a color profile which is stored in the device and is not designated by the user, and wherein the designation by the user is performed on a user interface.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of Claims 7, 12 and 17, and in particular is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the features of adding or deleting resources to be downloaded in accordance with whether or not a user designates the resources on a user interface. If the resource is a font or a form, the processing of this resource is changed over to processing for adding a font or a form which is designated by a user and is not stored in the device, and deleting a font or a form which is stored in the device and is not designated by the user; otherwise, if the resource is a color profile, the processing of this resource is changed over in the changeover step to processing for adding a color profile which is designated by the user and is not stored in the device without deleting a color profile which is stored in the device and is not designated by the user.

Page 10 of the Office Action concedes that Sasaki does not disclose changing over to processing for adding on a font or form which is designated by a user and is not stored in the device and deleting a font or form which is stored in the device and is not designated by the user.

Nevertheless, the Office Action relies on Aschenbrenner (Figure 3, Column 11, lines 11 to 21 and Column 12, lines 51 to 59) for this feature.

As stated in the Office action on Page 11, Ashenbrenner discloses two conceptual methods for holding downloaded resources: caching and capturing. In addition, cached resources are deleted when a server session ends, and when the printer is powered down or re-started. Capturing overcomes the temporary nature of caching. Once an object is captured, it becomes a resident resource in the printer and lasts across server sessions and printer power-off cycles. Resources may be captured by the printer if the resource is made capturable and if the printer has sufficient storage to save the resources.

In the Office action, Applicant's recited color profile is equated to Ashenbrenner's "captured" resource and Applicant's recited font or form are equated to Ashenbrenner's cached resources. However, the Office action acknowledges that, according to Ashenbrenner, cached resources are deleted when the server session ends, or when the printer is powered down or re-started. In addition, whether or not a resource is "captured" or "cached" is determined by the nature of the resource and the availability of storage space. That is, the user has no control over whether or not a resource is cached, and therefore subject to being deleted, or captured and retained as long as resources permit. Therefore, Ashenbrenner fails to disclose or suggest that it is a user, using a user interface, that designates whether or not fonts, forms and color profiles are deleted when appropriate as featured in the present claims.

Thomas, Nishida, and the PostScript specification have been reviewed and are not seen to remedy the deficiencies of Sasaki and Aschenbrenner.

Therefore, independent Claims 7, 12, and 17 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Claims 19 and 26

Independent Claims 19 and 26 generally concern displaying a color profile capable of being loaded into a device having a printing function. Information of a destination device and types of page description language used for the destination device are also acquired.

According to one aspect of Claims 19 and 26, types of color profiles capable of being loaded into the destination device are determined in accordance with the acquired types of page description language. By virtue of this feature, it is ordinarily possible to ensure that a color profile is usable at a destination device.

Referring specifically to claim language, independent Claim 19 is directed to a resource display method for displaying a color profile capable of being loaded into a device having a printing function. The method includes a step of acquiring information of a destination device and acquiring types of page description languages used for the destination device and a step of determining types of color profiles capable of being loaded into the destination device in accordance with the types of page description languages acquired in the acquiring step. The method also includes a step of identifying a color profile, which is loadable into the destination device, based upon the types of color profiles determined and color space information of a loadable color profile; and a step of displaying the color profile identified; wherein it is determined in the determining step that a source profile and a destination profile are a color profile capable of being loaded into the destination device in a case where the type of the page description language used for the destination device is a first type, and wherein it is determined in the determining step that a source profile is a color profile capable of being loaded into the destination device in a case where the type of the page description language used for the destination device is a second type.

Claim 26 is directed to a resource display method for displaying a color profile capable of being loaded into a device having a printing function. The method comprises a step of acquiring information of a destination device and acquiring types of page description languages used for the destination device, a step of determining types of color profiles capable of being loaded into the destination device in accordance with the types of page description languages acquired in the acquiring step, a step of identifying a color profile, which is loadable into the destination device, based upon the types of color profiles determined and color space information of a loadable color profile, and a step of displaying the color profile identified, wherein it is determined in the determining step that a source profile and a destination profile are a color profile capable of being loaded into the destination device in a case where the type of the page description language used for the destination device is a first type, and wherein it is determined in the determining step that there is not a color profile capable of being loaded into the destination device in a case where the type of the page description language used for the destination device is a second type.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of Claims 19 and 26, and in particular is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of determining types of color profiles capable of being loaded into a destination device in accordance with acquired types of page description language wherein it is determined that a source profile and a destination profile are a color profile capable of being loaded into the destination device in a case where the type of the page description language used for the destination device is a first type, and wherein it is determined that a source profile is a color profile capable of being loaded into the destination device in a case where the type of the page description language used for the destination device is a second type as featured in Claim 19. Nor do the cited references disclose or suggest that it is determined that a source profile and a destination profile are a color profile capable of being loaded into the destination device in a case where the type of the page description language used for the destination device is a first type, and that it is determined that there is not a color profile capable of being loaded into the destination device in a case where the type of the page description language used for the destination device is a second type as featured in Claim 26.

In contrast to the present claims, Sasaki teaches a print system consisting of a client apparatus for outputting print data, a printer server apparatus for receiving the print data from the client apparatus, and a printer apparatus for printing the print data. The printer server apparatus in Sasaki stores a printer description file for a printer, wherein the printer description file contains printer specific information such as types and sizes of applicable print paper, the number or range of reproducible colors, and types of expandable page description language. (See column 8 lines 34 to 48 of Sasaki). In the Office Action, it is conceded that Sasaki fails to disclose or suggest determining types of color profiles capable of being loaded into the destination device in accordance with acquired types of page description language as recited in Claims 19 and 26. However, the Office action relies on the PostScript specification as disclosing such a feature.

The PostScript specification discloses using a color-rendering dictionary in a PostScript printer. The Office action contends that the PostScript specification is relied upon to teach that given a type of page description language, such as PostScript, it is possible to determine types of color profiles that can be loaded into a printer. However, it does not follow that the relied upon feature of the PostScript specification discloses or suggests determining that a source profile and a destination profile are a color profile capable of being loaded into the destination device in a case where the type of the page description language used for the destination device is a first type, and that a source profile is a color profile capable of being loaded into the destination device in a case where the type of the page description language used for the destination device is a second type as featured in Claim 19. Nor does the cited feature of the PostScript specification disclose or suggest that it is determined that a source profile and a destination profile are a color profile capable of being loaded into the destination device in a case where the type of the page description language used for the destination device is a first type, and that it is determined that there is not a color profile capable of being loaded into the destination device in a case where the type of the page description language used for the destination device is a second type as featured in Claim 26.

Therefore, independent Claims 19 and 26 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the claims, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

CONCLUSION

No claim fees are believed due; however, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank L. Cire #42,419/
Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicants

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200